FACSIMILE TRANSMITTAL SHEET

SCHIFF HARDIN & WAITE

A Partnership Including Professional Corporations
6600 Sears Tower, Chicago, Illinois 60606-6473 (312) 258-5500
Facsimile: (312) 258-5700 World Wide Web: http://www.schiffhardin.com

CLIENT/MATTER NO.: 27630-0001
DATE: Friday, June 27, 2003 08:51:48 AM

TO THE FOLLOWING:

NAME: Matthew Anderson
COMPANY: USPTO
FACSIMILE NO.: 17037465703 COMPANY NO.:

FROM: DIRECT DIAL NO.: 312.258.5779

Transmission consists of cover sheet plus 02 page(s).

If there are any problems with this transmission, please call 312.258.5779

COMMENTS:
Telephone Interview Discussion Points

Please call me at (312) 258-5779 if you have questions... otherwise, I'll contact you in the a.m. to slate a p.m. time. Please note I will be leaving at 3:30p.m. your time.

Thanks for your efforts.

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

INFORMAL / DRAFT
TELEPHONE INTERVIEW DISCUSSION POINTS

APPLICANT:	Stefan PFAB	DOCKET NO:	P00,0365
SERIAL NO.:	09/486,908	ART UNIT:	2186
FILED:	May 11, 2000	EXAMINER:	M. Anderson
TITLE:	DATA STORAGE DEVICE WITH OVERLAPPED BUFFERING SCHEME (as currently amended)		

Examiner Matthew Anderson
Washington, D.C. 20231

Dear Examiner Anderson:

Thank you very much for agreeing to a telephone interview in the above identified case on June 27, 2003 at a time to be arranged, which is currently under a final rejection based on the Office Action (OA), dated April 4, 2003.

I think I see where we have been differing in our analysis of the Pawlowski reference and I would like to talk with you to see if we can come to an agreement of how this reference should be interpreted or what claim language should be used to capture the distinction.

I believe that you have been equating the combination of Pawlowski's I/O module and main memory with the "data storage device" of claims 1 and 9 in the present invention. You indicated in your Response to Arguments section of the last Office Action that a peripheral of Pawlowski can request (and receive) some arbitrary amount of data, e.g., greater than one addressable cache line, with a single request, thereby anticipating claims 1 & 9 of the present invention.

We do not disagree with this characterization *if* it were proper to equate Pawlowski's I/O module ***and*** main memory with the "device" of the present invention. However, the "device" of the present invention should properly be equated with ***only*** the main memory of Pawlowski (as you yourself indicated at the start of paragraph 7 of your Office Action), and that the I/O module acts as a separate entity (I refer to line 3 of numbered paragraph 10 in your Office Action) that is between the memory and output terminals. The disadvantage of Pawloski's use of the I/O module and main memory is that it involves an extra step—the main memory can only be accessed in cache line chunks and on cache line boundaries... it requires extra processing by the I/O module to discard extraneous data and concatenate data that spans cache line boundaries.

We would like to propose the following amendment to claim 1 (an 9), which we believe adequately distinguishes the present invention from the art that you cited against it. We would like to get your thoughts on this proposed amendment.

1. (proposed amendment) A data storage device, comprising:

memory cells, each having stored data with selectable output addresses;

wherein said storage device responds to a data output request by outputting said stored data beginning with a selected output start address; of memory cell

wherein selectable output start addresses of the memory cells are spaced from one another such that an amount of data that can be stored between neighboring output start addresses of the memory cells is smaller than an amount of data output in response to said data output request.

We respectfully ask that you take these factors and the proposed amendment into consideration for our interview. We also welcome any suggestions you might consider for claim language that could emphasize these distinctions should you deem it necessary. Again, thank you for your time, consideration, and willingness to conduct the interview.

Sincerely,

Mark Bergner (Reg. No. 45,877)

Mark Bergner
Schiff Hardin & Waite
6600 Sears Tower
233 South Wacker Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60606-6473
(312) 258-5779
Attorneys for Applicant

device

size